UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

SPECIAL!

In the next issue of UNITY*—August 1st*

"Is Religious Liberty Dead In America?"

—An exposé of the part played by religious bigotry in the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

—The defeat of "Al" Smith for election in 1928 and for nomination in 1932 by anti-Catholic prejudice and hate.

An Editorial by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 19

Chicago, July 18, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*
Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 291
The Unpardonable Sin—Living Without Work—EDMUND B. CHAFFEE 293
ARTICLES—
The Philippines, India, Korea—*Abraham Lincoln* 291
Vox Populi—Challenge to Mr. Henderson—SYDNEY STRONG.. 295
How Militaristic Is England?—WILLIAM C. ALLEN..... 298
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
In Justice' Name—The Mooney Case—HENRY E. SWENSEN... 299
Free Speech Lies Bruised—HENRY E. SWENSEN..... 299
To Krishna Kant—KENNETH W. PORTER..... 299
Buried Cities—JOSEPH LEISER 299
George Washington, We Need You Now—LOUIS GINSBERG.... 300
THE STUDY TABLE—
More Light on India—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS..... 300
A New Book on Gandhi—RICHARD B. GREGG..... 301
CORRESPONDENCE—
A Private Letter from Russia—H. 302
"The Mistakes of Jesus"—WILLIAM FLOYD..... 302
Unitarianism—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER..... 302
The Peace Pledge for Women—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH..... 303
Miss Trent's Gandhi Poem—ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY..... 303
THE FIELD—
Announcement 290
Proposed Memorial to Dr. Anna Garlin Spencer..... 290
Call for Day of Prayer for July 29..... 303
Where the Settlements Stand on Federal Unemployment Relief. 303

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Announcement

To be published in issue of August 15 an article by

EDWARD HOLTON JAMES

"NEW LIGHT COMING ON THE SACCO-VANZETTI CASE"

In September 1927 UNITY stated: "A work of violence and horror, like that achieved upon Sacco and Vanzetti, disrupts the cosmic order, which itself must strive till it is whole again. The agitation for the release of these men, which began years ago, will continue, now that they are dead, for years to come, until at last the truth is known and heard. There are millions of men who will never forget, until Sacco and Vanzetti are justified. There are thousands of men who will never rest, until the work of justification has been carried through to its triumphant end.

All those who labored for this case, all those who followed it through the years, all those who mourned the outcome will want a copy of this issue.

SEND NOW

For extra copies at 10 cents each to

Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago

Proposed Memorial to Dr. Anna Garlin Spencer

A memorial, or memorials to Dr. Anna Garlin Spencer is projected by a committee which includes representatives of many groups with which Dr. Spencer was connected, and to which she contributed so lavishly. Tentatively, these will include a memorial volume to contain a memoir and a selection from Dr. Spencer's own writings, and the foundation of an Anna Garlin Spencer memorial lectureship to provide at stated intervals lectures by authorities on the questions to which our friend devoted her life.

I have been asked to bring these memorials to the attention of readers of UNITY, and to ask from them suggestions of approval or disapproval, and to invite all who have letters or materials which would help in preparing the memoir to send them to me at 285 Madison Avenue, New York. They will of course be returned in due season.

EDWIN FAIRLEY.

UNITY takes pleasure in endorsing and commending this worthy project. Mrs. Spencer was for many years a

(*Continued on page* 303)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, JULY 18, 1932 Number 19

THE PHILIPPINES, INDIA, KOREA . . . !

"In all ages of the world, tyrants have justified themselves in conquering and enslaving peoples by declaring that they were doing it for their own benefit. Turn it whatever way you will, whether it comes from the mouth of a king, or from the mouths of the men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is the same old serpent. They all say that they bestride the necks of the people not because they want to do this, but because the people are so much better off for being ridden. You work and I eat. You toil and I will enjoy the fruits of your toil. The argument is the same, and the bondage is the same. . . . Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off an existing government which they deem unjust and tyrannical, and form a new one which suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right, a right we hope and believe will liberate the world."

—Abraham Lincoln.

The *Christian Register* and the *Christian Leader* have this year both adopted the policy, begun some years ago by UNITY, of publishing through the summer months on a bi-weekly instead of a weekly schedule. These magazines announce, as we have announced, that they are adopting this policy "in the interests of economy." But as we have watched our own practice for several years, we are tempted to believe that this bi-weekly schedule will eventually be adopted by all weekly papers on its own merits—as perfectly adapted to the summer habits of the American people. We would again announce that our fortnightly program, begun with this issue, will continue through September.

The Boston *Herald* declares that "the Democrats probably elected Hoover when they nominated Roosevelt as their standard-bearer." With this judgment we agree. The weaknesses of Franklin D. Roosevelt as a presidential candidate are both political and personal. Politically it is quite impossible for the New York Governor to carry those states without which no Democratic ticket can be elected. It is conceivable that he may win New York by surrendering his soul to Tammany on the issue of Mayor Walker, but this barefaced bartering of honor would surely lose him in turn certain essential states in the middle and far West. Whatever is done or not done, it is difficult to make out any list of states which may give Gov. Roosevelt the majority of electoral votes in November. Mention of Tammany and the Walker issue brings us at once to the personal aspects of the Roosevelt candidacy. The Democratic nominee loves to pose as a brave, strong, independent man. The very intensity of this pose, its frequently excited and irritable quality, is sure indication of its rootage in the spiritual soil of conscious inferiority. As a strong man, in other words, Franklin D. Roosevelt is the most arrant sham in American political life today. Like many another man well-born and well-educated, he began his career with his innate attributes of decency and honor conspicuously to the fore. With his election as governor of New York and the prospects of the presidency looming before him, there came the change which reveals with ghastly clearness the real character of the man. For four years, now, he has trafficked with Tammany Hall on Tammany Hall's own terms, and therewith made himself part and parcel of the most disreputable political machine in the nation. For four years he has played fast and loose with his own convictions and the convictions of other men, until his opinion on no question can be trusted. Caught by ambition, he has shown himself as a man to be utterly characterless, and as a candidate to be utterly unscrupulous. That Mr. Roosevelt should have secured his nomination through the treason of Mr. Garner to his own constituencies, the sweet vengeance of Mr. McAdoo on his old enemy, Smith, and the conspiratorial connivance of William Randolph Hearst, is altogether fitting.

The three political conventions have now been held and they have all gone "wet." This was to be expected of the Democrats, who took the plunge four years ago under the leadership of the dripping "Al" Smith. It was to be expected also of the Republicans, in spite of their identification with the "drys," since they saw a chance to hold the "drys" by the magic of phrase mongering, and at the same time capture the "wet" vote by making hypocritical concessions. But this was not to be expected of the Socialists, who we had thought were above and apart from the disreputable business of bartering platform planks for votes, and were really concerned with fundamental issues. Yet these Socialists were so much like the rest of the politicians that they allowed themselves to get all excited over the question of drink at an hour when millions of people in this country have no food, and lined up smugly and com-

placently with the New York *Times* and the Chicago *Tribune*, with "Al" Smith and Senator Bingham, with John J. Raskob and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in a demand for a repeal of the 18th Amendment. Their accompanying demand that the liquor business be handed over to the nation was as egregious a piece of "bunk" as the demand of the Republicans that the "dry" states be protected from the "wets." We call all this disgusting—and a disgrace to the Socialist Party. What the Prohibitionists are to do in the midst of this sudden flood of "wetness" may seem doubtful. But of two things we feel sure! First, they must *not* follow the pitiful example of John R. Mott, who has surrendered as shamefully on this question as he did on the question of the War. Secondly, they may well ponder the counsel of Senator Borah, who stands as true as steel—to focus attention on representatives and senators, and thus make sure that a "dry" Congress is re-elected. We believe as firmly as ever that this country is "dry," or can be held "dry" by brave, undaunted leadership.

We picked up our New York *Times* the other day and found ourself face to face with a full-page "ad" written, or rather signed, by our old friend, Henry Ford. This was one "ad," we understand, in a series which is to appear in all the great newspapers of the country. The "ad" had nothing to do with Ford cars, which is the only thing that Henry knows anything about. It was concerned rather with the state of the nation, and told us what we must do to set things straight. If there is a worse leader in matters political and economic in America today than Henry Ford we do not happen to know who he is. But by reason of unlimited money and of impudence unparalleled, this unlettered mechanic undertakes to determine the policies of the Republic! We were listening at our radio the other night, and heard the dulcet strains of the theme-song announcing the advent of Amos 'n' Andy. As the music died away, we gritted our teeth and gripped our fists as we waited for the intolerable talk of the Pepsodent sales-agent, when, to our vast surprise, the oily voice stated that the manufacturers of the famous toooth-paste were not going to speak of their unrivalled product this evening (thank God! thank God!!) but instead would address their fellow-citizens on national affairs. Then followed a talk about taxes, economy, and what not, which contained more economic fallacies, half-truths, and plain, downright falsehoods than there were seconds in the broadcast. Only when Amos 'n' Andy were allowed to speak, did any common sense come over the air. Here, now, are two experiences within a week which would seem to indicate that our advertising magnates, our manufacturers and big business men, are setting out to save the nation in the hour of its extremity. This is only fair, perhaps, in view of what these same men have done to wreck it. But what competence do they have to speak, and what are we to think of a situation which permits sheer ignoramuses to buy up newspaper space and the far-flung currents of the air, and thus by the sheer power of money to control the minds of the people?

Can the people get rid of war? That is, the people of the various countries of the world as contrasted with the governments! Governments have failed for lo, these many centuries, and are failing still today. Why not give the people a chance in this democratic age, before it is too late? It is this question which seems to have moved the international committee, whose appeal by Romain Rolland for "a world congress against war" we have printed in these columns. This committee is headed by Henri Barbusse, Romain Rolland, Albert Einstein, Heinrich Mann, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Maxim Gorky, and Mme. Sun Yat-sen. An associate committee, organized in this country, is led by Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair, and John Dos Passos. The membership of the proposed congress, which is called for Geneva on August 1st next, will include no statesmen, diplomats, or other representatives of governments—an initial guarantee of success! It will have no political, military, or naval experts—another sure sign of success! It will simply be composed of *people* —men who fought in the last war, men who will be conscripted to fight in the next war, women who mourned for the one and fear for the other. There will be representatives of labor organizations, and also of peace societies. What this congress will do, as it meets cheek by jowl with the so-called Disarmament Congress, is not known. The program has not yet been adopted. But the purpose is clear—to aim straight and sure at war, to lay down the ways and means of getting rid of war, and to mobilize the common people to support these drastic measures. Our own hope is that the congress will recognize and adopt the triumphant policy of Mahatma Gandhi. Non-violent non-cooperation is the way out. Let the workers pledge themselves to strike in case of war; let the young men everywhere pledge themselves to refuse conscription; let the tax-payers pledge themselves to deny payment of war taxes. This is revolt, of course. But we are convinced that the world situation is desperate, and that nothing but a revolt, a universal uprising of peoples everywhere, can save it.

The project of a World Jewish Congress, set forth with characteristic courage and vision, by the American Jewish Congress, interests us greatly. It seems to us to be a movement which is not only timely but, in its own way, inevitable. Indeed we find it difficult to un-

derstand the opposition to this undertaking, which seems to be headed by Dr. Cyrus Adler, President of the American Jewish Committee. Internal divisive factors, happily unknown to us, but present in Jewry, we imagine, exactly as in all other groups of human beings, undoubtedly have part in this opposition. But the case is being argued on its own merits and demerits (see the New York Jewish weekly, *Opinion,* issue of June 27th last), and it seems to us that the sponsors of the World Congress idea have everything on their side save only timid counsel and base self-interest. The movement at bottom is a movement for democracy in Israel, just as the earlier movement which resulted in the establishment of the American Congress was similarly democratic in spirit. It is a demand that Jews even the humblest shall have a voice in the determination of their hard-pressed destiny. It is a revolt against the assumption that Jewry can best be controlled from within by an aristocracy of birth and wealth. Judge Brandeis has described the American Congress as "an instrument (of the Jewish people) through which their will may be ascertained, and when ascertained, may be carried out." Statesmanlike Jews of prophetic power and vision now rightly seek a similar "instrument" in the world at large. Surely the times cry out for such a body. Jews today are face to face with a supreme crisis in their history. Anti-Semitism is fiercer and more widespread than at any time since the Middle Ages. Prosecution and suffering surpass anything seen since the horrors of the Inquisition. The crumbling of a political and economic system in which the Jews hold a peculiarly hazardous position threatens their whole existence. Who should, or will, grapple with these problems if not the Jews themselves? If they need and want help, must they not first help themselves? The Jews are a world people, and should have a world consciousness, a world vision, a world voice, and a world will. This the proposed Congress can give. We hope that the preparatory meeting called to assemble in Geneva on August 14th next, will act with undaunted courage, and definitely arrange for the convening of a World Jewish Congress in 1933.

The news that Dr. W. E. Orchard, the famous Congregational minister of Kings Weigh House, London, has joined the Roman Catholics, with hope of entering the priesthood, seems to have surprised many of his friends. We cannot understand why! For years Dr. Orchard has been practising all the rites and ordinances of the Catholic communion, and it was only a question as to whether he would ultimately turn to Rome or to the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Established Church. His decision in favor of Rome shows logic as well as courage. What is really significant in Dr. Orchard's action is its record of one more distinguished Englishman gone over to Roman Catholicism. Gilbert K. Chesterton and Hillaire Belloc have long been well-known Catholics. In addition must now be listed such persons as Ronald Knox, Alfred Noyes, Sheila Kaye-Smith, and, as the latest but by no means the last, Dr. Orchard. Another addition should properly be the great leaders of the Anglo-Catholic movement, which belongs to Rome in everything except the recognition and acceptance of the infallible Pope. Also, there is the famous Reginald G. Campbell, who deserted Congregationalism for Episcopacy! What names have we here in America to match these in England? There are great names in our Catholic Church, but they are names which play little or no part in the literary and cultural life of this country. As for the so-called Catholic wing in the Episcopal Church, it has no intellectual standing or even repute. Of course, there are forces in English tradition, which have great influence upon Englishmen, which have never appeared in America at all. Furthermore, England is nearer those conditions of social break-up which invariably lead to mystical, ritualistic, and esoteric tendencies in religious experience. But it is curious, all the same, that we have practically nothing to match what is so conspicuous and impressive a development in English life today.

The Unpardonable Sin—Living Without Work

There is a sin which I venture to assert has done more harm to the human race than any other. It is the sin which is the root cause of nearly all our social ills. It is the sin of living without work. When I use the phrase, "living without work," I use this expression merely for brevity. What I have in mind is something far deeper. I mean the urge within all of us to get away from the stress and strain of working to supply our own economic wants by shifting the burden to the backs of our fellows. This has been for ages and is today the root sin in the life of man for from it come most of the others. Out of it grow our gigantic social evils, poverty, imperialism and war.

In primitive society this basic sin found its typical expression in the status of women. The hard work, the drudgery, the unpleasant tasks were thrust upon them. They looked after the children; they prepared the food; they waited upon the men; they tilled the soil. The men hunted and fished; they did the work which was filled with zest and pleasure. The rest was shunted off upon the women. The men were relieved of the stress and strain of the disagreeable task by the

simple device of making it the woman's job. There is a survival of this today in the easy way in which men are able to keep up the superstition that only women can wash dishes. Mankind first exploited women.

In the great empires of antiquity the sin of living without work found its most common expression in the institution of slavery. Men captured in war were enslaved and their children were born into the slave status. Thus there grew up a body of people who were compelled to do the hard work, the drudgery. The civilizations of the ancient world rested upon the backs of slaves. Whether in Egypt, Babylon, Greece or Rome the story was the same. Society rested upon slaves. Slavery, this expression of the desire to live without work survived almost to our own day and even in our own land it was not abolished until the civil war. This institution of human slavery was one of the most if not the most terrible expression of the sin we are discussing.

But with the passing of slavery in Europe there came an institution which was merely another expression of this devil within us, this desire to live at the expense of our fellows. That institution was feudalism. Through this rather clever device the vast majority of men were chained to the soil and made to do the work that the few might have and enjoy the fruits. Western civilization was dominated by this system for centuries. In Russia it lasted well into the last century. While this institution of feudalism may seem romantic to some of our sentimental writers it was actually a cruel instrument of oppression which grew up out of the desire of powerful men to live and enjoy without the stress and strain of producing those things which made that life and enjoyment possible. Like slavery, feudalism was an expression of the root sin in the life of man, the desire to live at the expense of others.

Women today are well on the road to freedom from male domination; slavery is found only occasionally and feudalism has practically disappeared. Can we say that the sin of which these institutions were the outward expressions has been eradicated? Can we say that the devil has been exorcised? Most unfortunately we cannot. Like some of those evil magicians in the Arabian Nights he has simply gone from one body into another. He has found refuge in our institutions today. It is true that feudalism has disappeared and we no longer have slavery but our social system does recognize other ways of making a living other than by labor of hand and brain. In modern society there are broadly two ways of receiving that income which enables a man to live. There is the way of work for which a wage is paid or a salary given which presumably bears some relation to the strain undergone in earning it. There is also another way, that of owning something. That something may be land; it may be stocks or bonds; it may be anything from which an income is derived. About this second way some questions may properly be asked.

What of the income received from the mere ownership of land? We call it rent. The man who receives it is called a landlord. The landlord did not make the land nor would the land pass out of existence if the landlord perished. The land has value only because men need it in order to live. We have somehow built up a system which permits a man to live by owning land. He need do nothing about the land. He simply owns it and people pay him money for the use of it. He appropriates for himself a value created by the community. Whatever strain the landlord undergoes is little compared with the strain of working with hand or brain. The values paid to the owner of land can come only from the labor of men and women. It seems as if the owner of land had somehow managed to get other men to feed and clothe him. He toils not; he spins not; he lives without work. There seems to be in this institution something reminiscent of feudalism and slavery.

Again there are the owners of stocks. These owners of stocks seldom do any work connected with the company in which they have their holdings. They need not even vote for the board of directors. However, it must be remembered that the owner of stocks may lose his money. Many have been finding that out in the past three years. The owner of stocks does take a risk and he does forego spending. This involves some strain. This is a strain too which some man or group of men must take if production is to go on. Here, then, the case is not always clear. Sometimes the holder of stocks is enduring weariness and strain which is equal to all he is receiving. At other times the real risk involved is so little that the return received is not so clearly deserved. Sometimes the income thus received is simply a method of living without work, a scheme for sharing in the products produced by others.

Then there is the income derived from owning bonds. The return is generally moderate and the risk is not great. About this kind of income we must ask whether the actual strain involved in taking the risk and foregoing spending equals the return received? Of course it is a difficult question to answer, but if the strain does not equal the reward obtained one is to that extent living upon his fellows, living without work.

Another method of living today is pursued by those who go into any kind of business. These men take a great risk, for the vast majority of business ventures fail. They have the worry and the responsibility. Anyone who has been in business for himself knows that there is no small strain to be found here.

Here again the question is purely one of the equality between the strain and the return. When one gets a return far beyond the labor he undergoes to that extent he is merely profiting at the expense of others. He is living without work.

And so we must test every conceivable kind of income present in our society today. Whether the income be called wages, salary, rent, interest, profits or what not, the searching question must be asked—what relation does the income bear to the strain undergone? To the extent that the income exceeds the labor, one is living without work and throwing an added burden upon his fellows. All this of course means that others besides thieves and robbers are guilty of this unpardonable sin. Political grafters are in the same category and gamblers also. Moreover, every form of monopoly, the holding of natural resources and franchises which enable the holders to levy toll upon the people, what are these but devices for living without work? The accumulation of stocks and bonds to such an amount that one can sit back and leave enough to his descendants so that they too can sit back and do nothing—this too illustrates what we are calling the unpardonable sin. Living upon one's relatives when one is well and able bodied or deliberately choosing to live upon charity when one can work are other manifestations of the same sin. The forms that it takes are endless, so that it behooves each one of us to ask some searching questions of himself. Am I sure that I am giving value received for what I take from my fellows? Am I sure that my income bears some relation to the strain I undergo in securing it? We cannot ask such questions too often, for living without work is one of the worst of all sins, for from it proceed most of the others.

And how can this desire to live at the expense of others be modified? The answer is not easy, but I am confident that the answer to it lies in the realm of religion. It is religion alone that can inspire men to love their fellows as themselves, to desire their well being as their own. Religiously minded men and women must encourage those endeavors which make for cooperation and they must discourage those that pit man against man. They must work to build up a sentiment which will condemn any and every man who tries to live without work. This sentiment must become as strong as patriotism. We must get back to the early ideal of the Christian church that he who would not work could not eat. We must see clearly this basic sin of living and desiring to live without work and we must make the world see it. We must call that world to repentance. Such is one of the greatest tasks before religious men today.

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE.

Vox Populi—Challenge to Mr. Henderson

[By Our Special Correspondent]

Mr. Henderson is in a receptive mood these days. He has received a large delegation representing those organizations that appeared before the General Disarmament Conference on February 6th, when the peoples of the world gave voice to their desires. That was the Day of the Great Petition. That was a fine kick-off, but for some reason the ball has not been advanced very far toward the goal since. To the public it looked as if the ball was most of the time out of bounds.

At any rate it occurred to those organizations, largely Christian and Labor, to call upon Mr. Henderson to learn from him how the game was progressing. So, the plan was hit upon to print all the sayings of the famous February 6th in a book to be presented to him on a public occasion, thus giving him and his armor-bearer, Mr. Baker (who was present at the "Battle of the Trocadero" last November in Paris), not only a Book of Remembrance ("lest we forget") but one for use in their daily devotions.

For fear they may be lost if uttered further on, I would make two remarks:

1. I challenge one statement made by Mr. Henderson concerning total disarmament. He said that those who sought for immediate total disarmament embarrassed those after real substantial disarmament, that this Conference was after reduction and limitation with a possible goal of total disarmament, to be reached by stages. Honestly, Mr. Henderson knows better. He knows that it will be perfectly consistent to abolish poisonous gas completely, or tanks or submarines—if the Conference so sees fit—and to "reduce" *all* armaments down to absolute zero, if the Conference so sees fit—and do it immediately. I am absolutely certain that the Vox Populi would sing aloud, Hallelujah! Further, as to total and general disarmament being the goal—for which he intimates he himself devoutly hopes—he knows football and knows that occasionally with a remarkably brilliant player the ball is taken at the first kick-off and carried clear across the field for an immediate goal, and not after slow stages. . . . The parable and moral are plain. Immediate total disarmament is consistent with the purpose of the Conference, and even more possible, and certainly more beneficial than operating for the Armament-disease of appendicitis, by slow stages, cutting off an inch now and then. Why not save big doctor's bills, and incidentally the life of the patient, and have it out at once?

2. As to the Christian organizations whose delegates took part in the reception and book presentation, and presented certain requests which they wished the General Conference to grant in the way of disarmament, they correctly affirm that they were the representatives of many millions of the people of the world. I am compelled with sadness to affirm—I am a Christian—that for the second time the Christians failed. They failed that first time after February 6th in going into an educational campaign instead of one of *action*. They failed this time in standing for the "good and

not for the best." This is not to say that great activities have not been carried on, in receiving resolutions from the world around, in broadcasting suggestions and peace news to all lands, in spending countless hours in committee; my idea is, that they failed to use the power that makes the Christian invincible.

The Reception

The meeting was held in Room L of the Glasshouse, at 5 p. m. One of the first people to enter the room was Mr. Pickard, Quaker, and chairman of one of the principal committees, in promotion of disarmament, and in charge of the arrangements for the reception. His arms were filled with material, printed or mimeographed, for the press or delegates. He is one of the lieutenants of Robert Cecil, who is standing for what is called the Budapest Plan, a plan created by an international meeting of the League of Nations Unions. Delegates, visitors, reporters, camera-men and guests of honor began to filter in, and last of all came Mr. Henderson and sat down behind a long table, being flanked by several other distinguished persons—on his right hand being Mr. Benes, Miss Woolley, Senator Swanson, on his left Mr. Baker, Mrs. Ashby, the last reminding me of an ancient Roman woman of the patrician type.

After Mr. Henderson had said, "Glad to see you!" Mme. D'Arcis of the "Vox Populi" Committee, in a felicitous address, presented Mr. Henderson with a special copy of the book, "Vox Populi," which contains all the speeches of February 6th. She referred to that unique event, as showing the unity of the world's desire. She quoted from the book (all splendid).

> Technical obstacles, however formidable, are not insurmountable if there is a strong will to overcome them.
>
> * * *
>
> The workers petitioned for the conclusion of a treaty leading to complete, universal and controlled disarmament at the earliest possible moment.
>
> * * *
>
> The failure of the Conference would be a world disaster.
>
> * * *
>
> The patience of the peoples is strained to the utmost. This is what we ask, or rather, this is what we demand. . . . The workers are firmly decided, if not actually to throw away their arms, at least, not to use them against one another.

Mme. D'Arcis reminded Mr. Henderson of his own words,

> If the people want disarmament, they can have it. If they exert their will, they can compel results. . . I hope the people will show the governments that however far they may be ready to go, their people will be behind them.

M. de Watteville thereupon stated what he had been instructed to name as the least result that was expected of the Conference (what a drop from February 6th!):

a) a substantial reduction of the national land, naval and air armaments;
b) the abolition of the most aggressive weapons;
c) the rigorous control, if not the suppression, of the private manufacture of, and traffic in, arms.

This was all! Was it possible that the committee was not aware that a three months' search by sleuths had revealed no "aggressive" weapons? Also, that the question of private manufacture of arms was highly controversial, that small non-industrial nations should not be expected to depend upon big States for military supplies! Further, the word "substantial" reminds us of one of Simon's expansive words, that has one foot on earth and the other on the Milky Way! What does "substantial" imply? Please define the Trinity—are there three substances or one? Pshaw!

When Mr. Henderson rose to reply, I was not in a receptive mood, I fear. It was a pleasant speech in spirit and tone and left the hearers in more optimistic mood. His discussion of the private manufacture of armaments was not convincing. The same is true of his discussion of a general all-round cut in expenses, for such a cut would leave the nations relatively less safe than at present, with the Big Powers more powerful in proportion than before. He also uttered the meaningless words of "substantial reduction." The most important word he uttered was, that

> "Above all, responsibility lies with the Great Powers, who maintain the principal armed forces of the world. It is they who can give the lead; and if they do make any great decision, they can be sure the rest of the world will gladly follow."

I applied it immediately; not in easy stages. I said, American and Britain—or Britain and America—that means *you.* (If anyone doubts this, he is invited to come out with his sword and try conclusions!) Don't look over your shoulders at France, but squarely into each other's faces, and say, *you Anglo-Saxon, greatest saint and greatest sinner,* it is up to *you.* Invite in God and let *him* tell you what to do—not in easy stages (there may be none); but *immediately.* Or invite in some man from Greenland or Thibet—just a normal man from the farm, an Amos—and ask him what to do to save your soul from the hell of war. O, Anglo-Saxon—man of blood and greed—give up your arms at once. Repent! It requires no Cambridge wisdom, no high-geared diplomat (who lies awake at night scheming)—just a little common sense, to tell you what to do. It is something you have to *do,* not to palaver over, but to *do.* That is to Disarm, to *Disarm,* and at once. The peoples are tired of promises of "pie in the sky"—of future "goals." They demand that you make that goal this year, 1932. You Anglo-Saxon (America, Britain), you *can* do it (don't lie and write hymns about it) for you had a part in partially disarming Germany. That was done in 90 days. If you contend that it can't be done so speedily—then, call in President Hindenburg. He could do it inside a year, do it gladly and for *nothing.* Ask him!

And then your civilization with foundation-stones like Shakespeare and Lincoln would have free course and run and be glorified! As it is today, your civilization is buttressed on cannon! The peoples are growing to hate and fear you. And your fall is only a question of decades, if you do not repent! That means total disarmament, not half. Your talk about "aggressive" weapons, about "private" manufacture of munitions, about "substantial" reductions—all this and like imbecility has become a hissing and a joke among even "heathen hordes."

I say to you, Britain and America—my beloved own Anglo-Saxon—you stand this year of the Lord (how we worship other "Lords"!) 1932, the chief enemy to the peace of the world, because you have the power (here Mr. Henderson is correct) which so far you have shown little sign of using for peace. I declare that it will be your fault if Total Disarmament is not actually completed within a year—not promised with crafty words tied up with a Permanent Disarmament Commission, functioning under the League of Nations—but *actually done* and the Committee discharged sine die and sent home to the activities of

peace. We *then* might have a League of Nations, able to deliberate without jumping at every shot of a gun. O, Anglo-Saxon! My beloved! Why not step into the glory that stands at hand? Is Zona Gale right? Is it greed? If so, your gluttony will be as stench in your mouth, and the children of neighbors will point at you with derision, as they pass by. Why not step right to the front and say, "Come all ye neighbor-nations. We bring all our arms, all, *all,* ALL, and lay them in the Common Cremation. Come with us!" As saith Mr. Henderson—such a decision the rest of the nations would gladly follow. Do it *now!*

After-Meeting Thoughts

Here are some of my thoughts as I walked away from the Glass-house; the well-dressed dispersing company, I confess, looking more satisfied and complacent than did my own heart. I walked along the Quai, named after our own Wilson (who was hand-cuffed by diplomats), across the long bridge, under which more waters run in a year than under London Bridge, slowly up Cathedral Hill, where Calvin labored for freedom of conscience. I was thinking.

First. In periods of anxiety and depression, like the present, men follow one of two courses. They are satisfied with a little, as drowning men catch at straws. In their lack or loss of faith they are satisfied with what they can get. That is what I fear the company of Christians and Labor may do in the present of disarmament. I suspect also that this has been formulated by clever diplomats who know the game. I could name some who are suspect! At any rate, the peoples (the Populi) of the world, in this period of anxiety, will be handed a sham disarmament and advised to thank God for even that, and sermons will be preached by eminent bishops and addresses by University presidents I know, proving what wonderful progress has been made since the days of Cain. (However, Cain, the first military man, was thrown out of the Garden, wasn't he? A striking precedent unhappily not followed today). The people will be enjoined to count their mercies, and name them one by one, as they count their beads or eat in the kitchens of aristocrats.

In days of depression, like the present, men may do something quite different, and make a long run of faith for the goal. I have been praying for a deadlock. This is where my hope comes in. This depression-time, when men like Mr. Henderson are preaching peace, when there is no peace, the *power* that is bigger than the Big Powers sometimes paralyzes the Big Powers (the leaders are blind men) in order to let something really big be born, some idea that has been moving in the womb of nature. Sometimes this is called a revolution. Sometimes it isn't. In any case it is a child of hope and faith—a time when man makes for the distant goal, and *reaches it.* This is one of those periods. It is a call for men and women of faith—not to be contented with crumbs that fall from statesmen's tables, with our children dying in hunger and blood—to make for the only goal which will mean disarmament, that is, total and immediate. And, O Anglo-Saxon, God has handed that job to you today. It is not a job for a putterer! It is your job—not France's, not Germany's, not Japan's—but yours, you long-legged, long-headed, politically-minded, far-planning, obstinate Anglo-Saxon, you modern Jacob with 100% name for veracity yet to establish. O Anglo-Saxon—mighty in games, in drinks, in conquests, in religion, in gunpowder, growing in arrogance—the center of the stage is yours today, the curtain is up, the audience is waiting, a great audience! Will you play the part of a great hero of the race, and hand humanity, not as an actor but as a son of man, before the curtain goes down at the close of 1932, a totally, universally disarmed world? The stage is yours. You can do it, if you will! Will you?

Now Is Time for Action

As I walked up Cathedral Hill, I turned upon myself and said, "Well, what have you got to offer? What is there to be done?" This is in part what I said to myself (remember, the subject is disarmament and the Conference).

1. The day for resolutions is over; this is the time for action.

2. The day of education is over. Education is essential and important, but when the General Conference was opened on February 2nd, it was time to close up the school books and get out into the field of action. Education at such periods is not only a diversion, it may be used as an opiate, especially when clearly propaganda for some specific scheme of disarmament.

3. The day of reflecting on the causes of war is over, this is the time for action. Such reflections are important, but they should be left now for winter evenings, sitting before the fireplace, eating apples and pop-corn.

4. This is not the time to discuss changes in the social frame-work, but for action. Well, what have I to mention as action?

First. Discover the location of the dominant will. I have located it to my satisfaction. It lies chiefly in my beloved Anglo-Saxon, and of course in the General Conference.

Second. Fix in mind, that you are after immediate, total disarmament and nothing less. Don't budge from that position, as you will be tempted to many times. His Satanic Majesty (in disguise) is still doing business, offering the old junk of kingdoms of this earth, by flattering offers of a high pinnacle seat, and even offers of a few meals catch some of the hungry, of those who compromise with truth.

Third. There are several tried ways to get the human will to move, when something important is needed to be done. One is:

Prayer. This must not be overlooked. It is an old weapon for gaining noble action from the stubborn. To have something definite in mind to gain is essential. The World Peace Movement of Women calling for a day to be set aside for prayer on July 29th is action in high realms that may touch buttons that will release power to move that is undreamed of. Let the Anglo-Saxon and the General Conference know that all over the world on that day they are being weighed in the balances of the Eternal Power within us. If Gandhi could have five minutes a day with the Conference and Commissions, it might change the atmosphere enough to effect important decisions. I urge all "within hearing of my voice" to pray with all their strength that the Anglo-Saxon and the delegates may be open minded to the immediate abolition of all arms. The temperance movement in America went on to higher ground with the saving of tens of thousands of young people from strong drink, because of a Women's Praying Crusade. I am watching Maude

Royden's Crusade in England. Strength to her! If she would hold prayer-crusades at the League and at all war-centers—who knows, it is worth trying.

Picketing. This is a form of action that has often brought results. It has been tried on all kinds of evil. It is working in India. Labor has found it useful, or it would not be used so much.

Thousands of veteran soldiers have marched on Washington in order to persuade the will of Congress to grant a mere "bonus." I have wondered what would happen if 5,000 young men or women or preachers or workers or soldiers advanced on Geneva, demanding total abolition of the murder-weapons of Hell and at once. I think I can see that the mountains round about Geneva would be filled with the "chariots of God."

Fasting. Here is a weapon long in use to gain divine ends (and if ever there was a divine goal, it is immediate, total disarmament) and that is fasting. It has been little tried in the West. Hunger strikes approach to it, and these have been found useful to break down stubborn wills. If the wives of all the delegates to the Conference and of all the Secretariat went on a hunger strike until total disarmament at once were granted, it would be given *before* the end of 1932.

Here are three ancient weapons for bringing slow or unreasonable authorities and judges around to reasonable mentality—exerted on wills, as Mr. Henderson says, "to compel results."

There are other kinds of technique, which will suggest themselves to others. I feel conscious and so convinced of the great Idea of Total and Immediate Disarmament being the one and only way to gain peace on earth—so far as armament is concerned—that I know it will gain the ascendancy of man's soul; that men by their own invention will find a way to action that compels results—that they *will find a way or make one.*

The leadership in this great crusade for definite peace I covet for my own beloved and stubborn Anglo-Saxon.

Yours for Total Disarmament Now!

SYDNEY STRONG.

Care, American Express,
Geneva, Switzerland.

How Militaristic Is England?

I often see in the post office of one of the smaller cities of England when visiting there, a tablet to the memory of twenty-three employees who lost their lives in the Great War. All perished in France except two in East Africa, one in Mesopotamia, one in Egypt, one in Palestine, one in Nigeria. This list is typical. Monuments and memorials are everywhere encountered in England, in little villages, in historic cathedrals, in great city squares. Everywhere there are many who affirm that the awful toll of young men—about one million of her best—was largely the result of fears fomented by certain newspapers, the talk of some "statesmen," the subtle propaganda of various sorts of "interests" which hoped to gain fortune or prestige from preparing for war, or from war itself.

Time-honored advertising of military affairs in England continues. Metropolitan newspapers keep the country quickened about such matters. Thus, the London *Times* of the date I pen this article, offers almost three long, small-typed, closely-printed columns of information as to changes of officers in the Admiralty and Regular Army, about the Regular Army Reserve Officers, the Royal Air Force, and so forth. The positions of cruisers and battleships in different parts of the world are detailed. Illustrated weeklies constantly display pictures of units of the fleets, or of army and navy officials. Many daily newspapers do the same. Every effort is apparently being made to maintain a military and naval spirit through these mediums.

Many national events of England are naval or military in their character, and are exploited as such. The annual Trooping of the Colors last year was a case in point. It was staged on the Horse Guards Parade, London. Many leading officers and titled people took part. Military representatives from the Dominions were in the procession. There were thousands of spectators. The Prince of Wales in the absence of the King took the salute. The Queen, members of the royal family, including the beautiful little Princess Elizabeth—there are but two lives between her and the throne—watched the "dazzling" scene from a window. "In the garden of 10 Downing Street," we are told, the Prime Minister, Ramsey MacDonald, "had his party." I question if he really enjoyed it.

The Tattoos are popular military performances, vivid, colorful, with pageants and massed bands of music. The Aldershot Tattoo last summer had 86,700 beholders. The Naval Tattoo, at Portsmouth, was a marvelous pageant. The London *Daily Telegraph* has editorially declared that "the Tattoo is still on the upgrade of popularity," and added: "The general public demands it as part of their yearly order of life." This great daily, while proclaiming that the Tattoo should not be confused with the spirit of militarism has also stated that such displays, "are a post-war development," adding:

> Superficial people please themselves with believing that the War made us all weary of military things. To say that the War taught the ordinary man to think of the army as part of the national life would be nearer the truth.

Much attention is paid to the Territorial Army—a volunteer reserve force, not the regular army. It has slightly decreased in strength the past twelve months, but the muster last summer was larger than that of recent years. We are told that 100,000 men went into camp and training. As in America, so in England, some men like to play soldier. The great English commoner, John Bright, when commenting on the army of his day, is reported to have said that it was "a gigantic system of out-door relief for the sons of the British aristocarcy." Is America unintentionally drifting in a similar direction?

The House of Commons, some time ago, earnestly discussed the then causes of decline in numbers in recruiting for the regular army. Lieutenant-Commander Kenworthy, M. P., said, "he believed one reason why recruiting was falling off was that young lads who went through the training corps were sickened with the military drill and routine." The Secretary of State for War protested that: "Men did not join the army because they did not believe in the army," and this despite the very serious unemployment situation. He said: "It seemed to be assumed that the only people who would join the infantry were the so-called working classes. . . . What about the middle classes and

the wealthy?" He asked that more of the hundreds of thousands of young men in excellent physical condition, those who "have no need to think of their economic future," should volunteer in the regular army.

The O. T. C. (Officer's Training Corps), has lately met with vigorous opposition from certain quarters. At a recent meeting of the London Educational Authorities an opponent of the Corps said, "I say that a boy of twelve years who uses a bayonet for the first time, can picture himself sticking the bayonet into somebody's body and killing him." The decision to have a cadet corps in the Councils' schools was reached by a vote of 20 to 14. The three hundred boy student cadets of the O. T. C. of the celebrated and very aristocratic Harrow School recently presented a petition to the management, declaring their training had become "a thing to be dreaded and avoided, and now universally condemned." The military brethren and most of the newspapers were horrified at this unprecedented incident. But at least one great newspaper, the *Daily News,* remarked that it is irrational to endeavor to maintain a war-time level in an age of the Kellogg Pact of Peace. The London *Times* has announced that after an existence of twenty-six years the Cadet Corps of the Queen's Own, Royal Kent Regiment, is to be disbanded, a contributory cause for this step being "the withdrawal of the Government grant to cadet corps." The military correspondent of the London *Post* has written: "After October, nine hundred and forty-seven companies of cadets, with a total (all ranks) of approximately 50,000, so far as Government financial support and recognition are concerned, will cease to exist."

Among the churches opposition to "preparedness" and war is not nearly as strong as in the United States. A system deeply rooted in the social fabric of an old country, with many ancient traditions, cannot easily be changed. The profits for a few wealthy and influential church members must be very great. Yet the 1930 Lambeth Council of Bishops in its encyclical took a more definite stand than ever before. Other church groups are tending in the same direction. At the banquet of the International Congregational Council in England last year, Lloyd George urged:

> I live in a quiet place in Surrey, far away from any towns, and I went there for quietness. Yet every day I can hear the rattle of machine guns in one camp, the hoarse roar of artillery down in the direction of Portsmouth and the new bombing aeroplanes. What for? To slaughter men. And this is going on now in every land on earth—I beg your pardon, in every civilized land on earth. It is really time the churches took this in hand.

In England, as elsewhere, people of international thought often fail to appreciate the meaning of the expression of others who hold different opinions from themselves. In the House of Lords last summer, two eminent admirals emphasized national defence in connection with apprehended danger from America. The London *Morning Post* bitterly commented on a recently issued book written by a leading American editor. In essence that book is an unnecessary attack on the pride of Great Britain. To quote its spirit: "Nothing can stop us. If Britain is foolish enough to fight us, she will go down more quickly, that is all." A distinguished British author has recently published a work of fiction wherein he prophecies and somewhat details a coming Anglo-American conflict, including a great naval battle in the mid-Atlantic. All these men assist the cause of militarism. Such talk and literature, on both sides of the Atlantic, furnish the military folks of Great Britain with exactly the kind of stuff they desire. Thus are forged the fears and armaments that induce war.

Fifty years ago, during a Budget debate, William E. Gladstone, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, asked for an additional one penny on income tax, bringing that tax to sixpence in the pound. Today the tax even on small incomes, is over 48 pence in the pound. Undoubtedly the financial burdens of the hour tend to diminish military ardor in numerous instances. Yet, to sum up, there are many reasons for believing that —as in other countries—the great majority of the English people, without realizing it themselves, are more susceptible to military appeal, are much more militaristic in their thought and emotions, than they were prior to the Great War.

WILLIAM C. ALLEN.

Trumpets on New Horizons

In Justice' Name

The Mooney Case

July 27, 1932, marks the sixteenth anniversary of Tom Mooney's arrest.

The voice of Wilson interposed,
Today the state again disclosed
That servile men devoid of shame
Defrauded Truth in Justice' name.

Shall altars groan with sacrifice
And withering bodies pay the price?
Shall ruthless men prolong the strain
Till Justice faint in writhing pain?

Awaken then, O sluggish land,
And strike the defiling callous hand!
Be warned—when Truth and Justice part
Decay has reached the nation's heart.

HENRY E. SWENSEN.

Free Speech Lies Bruised

Freedom walks with lurking fear
Of hounds that are sleek and cold,
Of brutal hounds with sneering lips—
Hounds of a vicious mold.

Their poisoned veins have robbed their sense
Of fellowmen in pain;
When freedom speaks they claw and bruise
As if no longer sane.

And when their clubs have quelled her voice
They bow at their master's feet,
Who pours again the tainted wine
And the hounds return to their beat.

HENRY E. SWENSEN.

To Krishna Kant

(Nine-year-old Hindu boy, who, when sentenced to four years' imprisonment for picketing, cried: "I am ready to die for Gandhi!")

"Suffer the little children to come unto me . . ."—
And England will not fail
To heed His word. Where should He be
But in an Indian jail?

KENNETH W. PORTER.

Buried Cities

Ubar in Arabia was a town
Where camels trafficked misty years ago.

Now all the desert's sand has settled down
On flat-roofed houses there and ceased to blow
Along her streets, so choked are they with dust.
Her markets and her temples are withal
Silent as the mounds against them thrust,
Forever muffled in a dusty pall.

Towns today are lost that have no need
For angry winds to ply their muted trade.
Swirling through them hurricanes of greed
Can blanket them as Ubar long has laid
On a shelf of earth, to man unknown,
Whose heart had hardened as a wall of stone.

JOSEPH LEISER.

George Washington, We Need You Now

George Washington, we need you now
To marshal hosts so we may hold
Our walls against the foe who make
The Golden Rule the rule of Gold!

Oh, with another Yorktown now,
Startle the souls of those who slumber!—
And at this time, this Valley Forge,
Rally once more a rebel number!

Rebels who march again on greed—
Those truer patriots who vow
To cross this greater Delaware!—
George Washington, we need you now!

LOUIS GINSBERG.

The Study Table

[From our Special Correspondent]

More Light on India

For some time past I have been intending to draw the attention of UNITY readers to two books recently published in this country. Even if it is difficult for them to obtain these books for themselves, I am sure that Americans interested in India will be interested to hear of them.

The first is H. N. Brailsford's "Rebel India."* I rarely agree with Mr. Brailsford's conclusions, and even in this excellent book I find him far too inclined to cover up the direct responsibility of the Labor Government in 1930. At his best he never seems *quite* certain in his mind about the Empire and the White Man's Burden and continuity of foreign and imperial policy. He comes near enough to the revolutionary barricade to shake hands over the top, but that is all. Nevertheless as an observer he is fearless, industrious and honest, which is more than one can say of ninety-nine journalists out of a hundred, and his account of India during his visit in 1930 is one of the best that I have read.

Mr. Brailsford successfully disposes of the myth that the Nation Congress represents only a minority of the population. He pays eloquent tribute to the discipline and restraint shown by Indian crowds in the face of extreme provocation. "At an election," he says, "Congress would sweep the Peninsula." Yet non-violence remains the basis of its code and terrorism is conspicuous only as the method of the police and military and of a few isolated groups and individuals on the popular side. Of the women he says that "out of the seclusion of centuries they stepped at the call of patriotism." Of the public gatherings, where as many as 20,000 people would meet, he remarks, "More sober and orderly meetings I never saw," and comments ironically that "the dispersal by lathi charges of such a gathering was described as maintaining order."

In his first chapter Mr. Brailsford shows how sheer poverty drove the Indian peasants to revolt and "ranged them behind Congress as its staunchest supporters." His account of the ensuing repression endorses the already overwhelming evidence of "biased" Indians and their English friends. He exposes the curses of usury and landlordism, firmly established by the laws and law-courts of the British Government: "The usurer felt that its strong arm sustained him in his right." As the line hardens between the oppressor and the oppressed the alliance between Imperialism and the Indian propertied classes becomes more and more apparent. Only a section of the industrial capitalists remains an exception to this rule, and of their aid the mass movement gladly avails itself. After the attainment of "Swaraj," as Mr. Brailsford shows, a split here is inevitable.

A chapter on "The Empire Slums" gives a truly terrible picture of town life. In the hot season when "one survives by taking four baths a day," Mr. Brailsford discovered two rows of workers' tenements *where a single tap supplied the needs of 700 human beings for all purposes.* He quotes the Whitley Report to confirm his picture of "one-roomed tenements with six to nine persons to a room." Such are the housing conditions of 97% of the Bombay workers. "These workers," he says, "are inefficient. What would you expect?"

Brailsford's account of the Meerut trial should be read side by side with "The Brown Man's Burden" (Holton James) to confirm the unspeakable wickedness of that interminable affair. After three whole years it still drags on, while the Crown prosecutor earns $379.00 *per day* for his services. The "crime" of the accused is, in effect, that of organizing trade-unions. Referring to the Labor Government (in power at the time) he admits that:

> Nothing in these two years has changed in the spirit and method of the Indian administration. It rules, as it always did, in the interests of capital. It still uses the tremendous coercive powers of the Indian penal code (so drastic that one wonders why emergency ordinances are ever necessary) to check the effort to organize the workers in Unions.

The inevitably cautious and timid attitude of a foreign bureaucracy on all questions of social reform is clearly exposed. Their game is safety and stability —hence "non-intervention in religious customs." Only a popular government will dare to deal drastically with social problems. Gandhi, the author, could not meet, for the Mahatma was at the time a guest of the King —Emperor at Yerawda Jail, but everywhere he found evidence of his work for the poor. Of Gandhi's ashram he writes, "Where there is a slum, there you will find its members . . . this is not a sterile religion." He finds the key to the mind of Jawaharlal Nehru (the Socialist leader of *Young India*) in "his love and veneration for Mr. Gandhi," and tells of an Indian lawyer (whose arm had been amputated as a result of "law and order") who said "We have kept the master's sayings. We have faced even the rifle and refrained from anger."

In his analysis of the causes of Indian poverty

*"Rebel India," by H. N. Brailsford. Published by Gollancz, London. Price 2/6.

Mr. Brailsford is disappointing. It is perhaps a pity that Congress had not yet published its "Report on the Financial Obligations between Great Britain and India" at the time when "Rebel India" was written. I fancy it would have materially altered Brailsford's views on the so-called "Productive Debt," especially so far as the railways are concerned. Nevertheless this is the first English book to make any reference that I have yet seen to the very important criticisms made by Sir William Willcocks on the silting up of canals in Bengal and the effect of railway embankments on flood and famine in Behar and Orissa. He also gives staggering figures of profits from British capital investments.

For the economic side I would rather recommend the reader to the second book to which I have referred —a much bigger book, of which, however, I shall give a much shorter summary. It is Freda Utley's† "Lancashire and the Far East"—a book that should be in the hands of every serious student of economic imperialism in Asia.

I find many of Miss Utley's conclusions as repugnant as those of Mr. Brailsford. Brailsford leans toward the Labor Government, Miss Utley toward Moscow. As every good Muscovite must regard Gandhi as a humbug scheming for capitalist interests (for which he doubtless gets more than his share of loin cloths and goat's milk) Miss Utley will hear no good of the Mahatma or the Congress. Nevertheless the bulk of this book, which is packed with statistical information on matters industrial and economic, constitutes a necessary and valuable piece of research.

Miss Utley's main thesis is that

> just as in the ancient world free labor was crushed down by the competition of slave labor, so in the modern world the European workers, in some industries already, and in others possibly in the near future, are being thrown onto the "dole" by the slaves of today: the workers in the colonies who economically at least are slaves (receiving wages barely sufficient to keep themselves alive and no more) and who have few personal and no political rights.

I must forbear reference to the interesting chapters dealing with the cotton industry in England—the post-war boom, the inflated capital values, and the subsequent slump of an industry heavily charged with loan-capital bearing an inflexible tribute. Nor have I space here to outline the causes given by Miss Utley for the decline of Lancashire trade in the Far East and the meteoric rise of Japan. It is in the final chapters on the Indian market that I found most interest, for here I felt on my own ground.

Here for example, is fresh evidence to add to the cumulative proof of India's growing poverty, for Miss Utley shows that the *per capita* consumption of cloth in India (taking "swadeshi" and imported cloth together) has declined since 1913. It is a pity that Miss Utley did not spend some time in India as she did in Japan, which would have saved her from one or two minor errors—as, for instance, the assumption that *khaddar* is made with machine-spun yarn. Altogether, however, her account of the causes and effects of Indian poverty fully proves her thesis that the decline and fall of the Roman Empire is repeating itself in our own time.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

London, England.

†"Lancashire and the Far East," by Freda Utley. Published by Allen & Unwin, London. Price 16/.

A New Book on Gandhi

Here is a book* about Gandhi and India that holds one's attention and reads very easily. So far as I can remember, it is the first book about Gandhi written by an American who has lived many years in India and has really been with Gandhi on many occasions. For this reason Bishop Fisher succeeds very well in describing and explaining his subject in a way that Americans will readily understand and like.

Many descriptions of Mahatma Gandhi have laid emphasis on his spirituality and mysticism; others have dwelt at length on his austerity, or his appearance, or the puzzle and bewilderment that he seems to be to so many Westerners. It is perhaps natural that an American, having come to know his subject well, should be able to see and tell us about Gandhi's strong common sense and practicalness. Bishop Fisher helps us to this understanding by making clear certain significant elements of the Indian environment and history and by applying well chosen analogies. In his introduction he says that the book is "an attempt to weigh eastern and western ideals, as well as spiritual weapons and machine guns, in the scales of practicability." He does not use the terminology of mere sentimental mysticism, and thus helps Americans to realize more clearly and fully the power and personality of this great leader.

So many Americans have been influenced by Miss Mayo's choice of sewage that Bishop Fisher has wisely included, by way of correction, some sane and healthy discussion of certain Indian customs and social problems along with his description of the Indian scene. His nearly twenty-eight years of life in India and his intelligence and fineness of character give weight to his appraisals.

A considerable part of the book is devoted to explaining Gandhi's method of non-violent resistance. There are good chapters on his program of hand-spinning, the poverty of India, the Hindu-Muslim problem, and a discussion of the oft-repeated question, "Can India rule herself?" It is good to find a whole chapter about Mrs. Gandhi and her devoted heroism. Another interesting chapter describes American influences on Gandhi and India,—the thinking and deeds of such men as Thoreau, Emerson, Woodrow Wilson, and Abraham Lincoln, and American democratic behavior in general. There is an honest and courageous discussion of missionary faults and failures, along with an estimate of the missionary contribution to Indian social reform.

If we except the three volumes done by C. F. Andrews, which are really a re-arrangement of Gandhi's autobiography, this book by Bishop Fisher is in many ways the best of all the books on Gandhi. As a work of art, Romain Rolland's is finer, but it is much less definite and was written some years before the recent mighty developments. Anyone who wants to understand Gandhi and his methods should read in addition to these, Winslow and Elwin's "Gandhi: the Dawn of Indian Freedom," Kirby Page's pamphlet and John Haynes Holmes's sermons on Gandhi, and if possible the collection of Gandhi's writings called "Young India 1919-22" published some years ago by Huebsch.

To whet the reader's appetite let me quote a few random passages.

"Gandhi has taken the highest ideals of the Christian west,

*"That Strange Little Brown Man, Gandhi," by Frederick B. Fisher. Published by Ray Ling & Richard B. Smith, Inc. $2.50.

which we have not cared or dared to practice, and turned them against us in a new statesmanship of moral force, which is more powerful against us, doubtless, because it is forged from our own yearnings. His power is that in the one nation most fitted for his kind of religious and political experiment, at the exact instant when a war-torn chaotic world was thirsty for a new way of life—at this psychological place and moment, he has made our visionary ideal practical and has hitched it to his cart. For he believes that love, indeed, shall rule the world. What is more he has proved that, at least for a time, moral force can defeat machine guns. . . .

"Yet Gandhi is using the force of moral resistance as a political and an economic weapon, proving the directed power of directed spiritual force as practically potent to win battles against navies and armies. He is not a peace fanatic fed only upon goat's milk and impossible ideals. In the negative sense of the word he is not a pacifist at all—he is a fighter; but a fighter who will not shed blood. He knew war before he knew peace. . . . He has turned from a war of steel because he thinks it is no longer practical, and because he has seen enough of the scattering of men's bowels in the trenches of modern murder. . . .

"'Civilization' says Gandhi, 'is the conquest of one's mind and passions. We can conquer our enemy without hating him. Moral force is not idealistically but actually greater than navies.' . . .

"He is not a showman. He simply believes passionately in his 'truth'; he not only talks about it, he lives it. He dramatizes his idea by giving a living example of what he means. That is why he is such good copy for the newspapers; for all successful news is full of images, examples, life, not disembodied ideas. It is front page copy when a politician actually lives as though he means what he says.

"He first inspired the angry people and then gave them something to do. These are the two primary laws of practical social psychology. . . .

"The bullets for his machine guns of the spirit were to come from the new vow of *Satyagraha* which he first took in South Africa, the vow of allegiance to truth. This vow meant not only loyalty to truth from a subjective viewpoint—that is, that he himself would never lie: but it meant also an insistence, an objective insistence, upon the application of truth to the problems of daily life. 'If a principle is worth anything, it's worth living' says Gandhi."

RICHARD B. GREGG

Correspondence

A Private Letter From Russia

Dear Mr. Holmes:

—I should have written you how the people are living and thinking. To write how they think would be to say—just like Moscow! What Moscow does nobody questions. You talk about anything, and you hear them say, "Comrade Stalin said this, or that, and so it is."

To my mind this is correct. Just as in any kind of business, we must have professional experts. If the government is a government of the people, it will think in the interest of the people. So the government here does the thinking.

At present we have a shortage of meat, so the government decided to raise rabbits. Now everybody is talking of rabbits. We also have a shortage of fish, but ask anybody and he will tell you how many fish there are in the lakes and rivers, only—no time for fishing! But this is being organized, and there will soon be plenty of fish.—

Not long ago we had a war scare. Like a tornado, it swept the whole country. Every boy and girl was ready. You could see them march to the training fields, singing revolutionary songs. If war is ever made on Russia, it will take more than poison gas to kill the enthusiasm of the people, of young Russia. Russia is young—the old Russia died and nothing is left of it. My enthusiasm for the Red Army is only because it is a safeguard against war. Japan was ready to make war on Russia, but after the May 1st demonstration, it changed its mind. The 1st of May shows the pulse of the Russian people, and Japan felt this pulse.

H.

"The Mistakes of Jesus"

Editor of UNITY:

It is gratifying to see in UNITY a long review of "The Mistakes of Jesus," even though your approval of the book is somewhat qualified. Probably no other editor of a religious paper would admit, as you have done, that Jesus did make mistakes. The New York *Times, Survey Graphic,* and other publications have refused to accept advertisements of the book, the very title being anathema to most people.

Perhaps you will extend your courtesy further by granting space for an attempt to justify the portion of the argument which you consider ineffective—the claim that Jesus lacks not only the immanence of an infallible God but also the spiritual quality requisite for a dependable human guide.

The spirit of a man is determined by his words and actions; the spirit of Jesus derives solely from his life as depicted in the gospels. Fundamentalists, of whom there are over thirty million in the United States, accept every word of the New Testament as divinely inspired; Modernists, of whom there are a few hundred thousand, select those passages which conform to their own conception of Jesus; Liberals, like yourself, reject the entire gospel of "John" and much of "Matthew," "Mark," and "Luke." If we go a short step further and reject all the evidence of these four unreliable evangelists, there is no Jesus.

Until some agreement is reached by Christian theologians and modern scholars as to which portions of the scriptures are historically accurate, the critic is justified in evaluating Jesus as presented in the complete Biblical narrative. What would be left of the spirit of Jesus if we disregarded everything that made him famous—his birth, miracles, parables, teachings, resurrection and ascension?

According to the gospels Jesus claimed to be the Jewish Messiah; expected the end of the world in his generation; taught a fiery hell for unbelievers and atonement for the sins of the guilty by the sacrifice of the innocent; claimed that miracles proved his divinity; believed in demoniacal possession; assured his followers that God would protect them and answer all prayers offered in his name; approved scourging servants and paying them whatever an employer chose; opposed thrift at times and advocated usury at others; urged acceptance of war as inevitable and approved punishment for debt.

Were all these ideas falsely attributed to Jesus, or did he make numerous mistakes? Did Jesus adequately explain relations between the sexes, or between employer and employee? Did he give definite instructions for preventing war, preserving health or making a living? Was his practical advice clearly enough expressed to enable us to apply it to modern conditions?

The spirit of Jesus was the best known two thousand years ago, but the spirit of UNITY, based upon new revelations, is now more enlightened.

WILLIAM FLOYD.

New York, N. Y.

Unitarianism

Editor of UNITY:

The columns of UNITY have recently carried articles by Raymond H. Palmer which have moved me deeply. They have affected me profoundly, for I find a great deal of spiritual fellowship with the author.

My experience in the ministry does not exactly parallel Mr. Palmer's, but has much in common with it.

In 1916 I was ordained to the ministry of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America. I held pastorates in that denomination until my trial for heresy in October, 1925. According to the provisions of the constitution of that church which I lived up to somewhat to the embarassment of my colleagues, I was my own heresy-hunter. I was deposed from the ministry on the basis of my own statement of unbelief and belief.

Then friends directed my attention to the Unitarian fellowship. My first Unitarian parish was in Athol, Massachusetts. I was there from the spring of 1926 to the spring of 1928. That first taste of Unitarianism was very happy. No one could have asked for a more sympathetic congregation.

In 1928 I came to Oklahoma City, fully expecting that my Athol experiences would in the main be continued here.

The church was small and poorly organized. And soon I discovered it had factions. Within a few months I was heartily sick of my choice. But I had burned my bridges and it was now a case of sinking or swimming. I have always had a fondness for swimming so I started for the shore.

A new church building, already projected, after some delay was begun. Ground was broken in the fall of 1928, and we occupied our present beautiful Georgian church with parish house and residence attached just before the summer vacation in 1929. While I was away in the Colorado Rockies enjoying my summer vacation, a movement was started to get rid of me in an utterly arbitrary fashion. Fortunately the congregation was in the main loyal. My enemies in the church were out-voted overwhelmingly. Most of them in consequence left the church or no longer attended.

The issue was hardly freedom of speech in the pulpit, although that did enter somewhat. I had made very clear, when I candidated for the pulpit, what my beliefs were and what I meant by freedom. The issue in my case was really whether a prominent layman was to dominate me or not.

Now if I had lost out in that struggle, I would have probably felt even more badly than I did. But both the congregation and the American Unitarian Association were in the main sympathetic. In all my dealings with the American Unitarian Association, I have had the most fair treatment. We have differed in some minor matters, matters of judgment. If I had lost out in my initial struggle here for leadership of the church, I could hardly have blamed the whole fellowship, for our fellowship is made up of strictly independent churches and our ministers are of many minds.

Our church in Oklahoma City has grown and prospered to the extent of attracting considerable attention. The minister has freedom of speech and the congregation has freedom of judgment. The minister asks only the same consideration in expressing his views that every member of the congregation has. That freedom seems to work here, whatever may happen in other churches.

Both at Athol and here I have prepared my public addresses on the basis of what seemed reasonable and sane to me. I have tried in a rather unoriginal way to bring to my people the best thought of our age. I have gone for inspiration to such men as James Harvey Robinson, Everett Dean Martin, H. G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, Walter Lippmann, and others, who are conscious that they live in the twentieth century. I am, if you must catalogue me, a humanist. I don't think it would be said that I falter in my speech. Neither do many Unitarian ministers of my acquaintance. They are pioneers of a living faith.

I find all the freedom I ever hoped for in Unitarianism. But this much is true, what freedom I have seems to have come to me both outside and within Unitarianism as a direct result of *taking it*. When I promised at Athol, for the first time in my ministerial life, that I would speak the truth, I felt that Unitarianism had offered me something I could not have possibly found in any orthodox church. Heretofore I had been concerned with keeping the faith, the faith as set forth in creeds. Now I was bound only to the truth.

Whatever the faults of expression, I have endeavored in season and out of season to speak what seems to me to be the truth. However, I am not a dogmatist. My philosophy of life is a changing philosophy bound up with experience. I find it difficult to say: "Thus saith the Lord." I am not a good party man. I am not even a good humanist, because I can say "God" without a wrench of my spirit. I find myself in the precarious position at times of dodging brickbats from both conservatives and radicals.

I shall continue to take my freedom whether that freedom keeps me within the Unitarian church or makes me a wanderer upon the face of the earth. I think, however, that I shall continue to the end of my days as a Unitarian minister.

HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER.

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

The Peace Pledge for Women

Editor of UNITY:

The account of the "World Peace Movement of Women" in UNITY of June 20 was like a beacon light to despairing wanderers imperilled by darkness and storm. May I say to readers of UNITY through your columns that copies of Mrs. Turner's pledge with space for signatures can be obtained from me at 18 Stearns Road, Brookline, Mass., or from Mrs. Annie E. Gray, Exec. Secretary, Women's Peace Society, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Please state number desired and enclose postage.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Brookline, Massachusetts.

Miss Trent's Gandhi Poem

Editor of UNITY:

I cannot refrain from saying a few words in praise of "Indian Messiah" by Lucia Trent, which appeared in UNITY of May 16th. Her understanding eyes have visioned the living flame within Gandhi's frail body. She has caught the spirit of his message of liberation and transmuted it into burning words. This poem will live.

It is most gratifying to note that your columns acknowledge the Mahatma's worth. May his labors for humanity be crowned with success!

UNITY is a challenging answer to our crying social abuses. It should be in every home.

ETTA JOSEPHEAN MURFEY.

Lakeland, Florida

The Field

(*Continued from page* 290)

member of UNITY's staff, and colleagues and readers should be able to help.—EDITORS.

Call for Day of Prayer for Peace Issued by the World Peace Movement of Women

Motzstrasse 6, Berlin—
Martha P. L. Turner

All women are called to join in the Day of Prayer for Peace, set by the World Peace Movement of Women for July 29th, 1932. If you feel that peace is really important, gather your friends for prayer on that day. Perhaps some church can be open with prayer continuing all day. Large or small groups meeting together at a certain time can be held in every community. And remember, as you go about your work of the day, that prayer can be offered at all times.

(In the American Church, Berlin, there will be prayer all day.)

Where the Settlements Stand

Resolutions Adopted by the National Federation of Settlements

Federal Unemployment Relief

Because of the intimate daily contact of settlement workers all over the United States with destitution more extreme than any we have ever confronted,

Because during the past winter we have met face to face thousands of men, women and children for whom it has been impossible to get adequate relief from any existing agency, public or private,

Because we know at first hand that in many cities, counties and states local funds are on the point of exhaustion,

Be it resolved that the National Federation of Settlements appeal to the President and Congress of the United States to come to the assistance of the state and local governments in organizing and assuring relief for the unemployed.

Unemployment Insurance

Be it resolved that we extend our congratulations to the governor and legislature of Wisconsin on the passage of the first Unemployment Compensation Act; that we send greetings to the state commissions in Ohio, California, Massachusetts and elsewhere which are canvassing the possibilities for such action; that we express our conviction that unemployment insurance is essential to preserve a minimum standard of economic security; and that we urge the governor of every American state to press for the enactment of similar measures to

protect American standards of living at their most vulnerable point.

Be it further resolved that we congratulate Senator Robert F. Wagner on his recent memorandum as a member of the Select Committee of the United States Senate which was charged with the investigation of unemployment insurance; that we concur in his advocacy of a compulsory system which would place on industry and, through insurance, upon the consuming public, a just share of the burden of unemployment now borne by working people, charitable givers and local taxpayers; that we endorse the principle he advances of federal encouragement of state legislation to this end, and specifically endorse his bill for the establishment of a federal-state system of employment exchanges and his proposal that payments made by industries into unemployment reserves and insurance be made deductible from income taxation.

Housing

Whereas the present unemployment situation calls urgently for the extension of federal credit to finance public works of a self-sustaining sort which will not lay further burdens on overburdened taxpayers, and

Whereas there is also a great and urgent need throughout the country for large scale clearance of bad housing and re-housing operations which cannot be financed by private capital or by local authorities, and

Whereas such clearance and housing operations would not only afford work directly and indirectly, but would result in noteworthy improvements in public health and family welfare and in a substantial reduction in delinquency and crime,

Be it resolved to petition Congress to include in any proposed measure of unemployment relief through federal credit, provisions for furnishing a considerable part of such credit under proper safeguards, to states, cities and limited-dividend housing corporations prepared to carry out clearance and re-housing operations.

Free Speech and Assembly

Resolved that in the view of the National Federation of Settlements the American answer to hunger and unrest is not suppression and police violence, but prevention through adequate relief of unemployment and through the achievement of greater economic security for all of us. The plight in which we find ourselves concerns everybody, and this is not the time to curtail public discussion of the issues.

Resolved that settlements should courageously defend the rights of the people to free speech as expressed by constitutional law.

Resolved that settlement houses should promote adult education through studying present economic conditions and prepare people for a constructive rather than a destructive way out of our present difficulties.

Be it further resolved that individual settlements and city federations make it their business to protest against clubbings, shootings or any other resort to that police violence which aggravates rather than dispels disorders; and that they urge upon the heads of police departments of their cities the utmost possible forbearance, and control of assemblies by peaceable means.

Mothers' Pensions

Resolved that the National Federation of Settlements call on social workers to help to protect the excellent mothers' pension systems that now exist in the country. At present, the mothers' pension system of the District of Columbia is threatened by a bill which has been recommended by the House District Appropriations Committee. This will limit the amount of relief. As the bill now operates, it permits the giving of relief on the basis of need which is a fundamental welfare principle. If the bill now before the House District Appropriations Committee is passed, mothers' aid throughout the country will be threatened. Immediate action by individual houses is urged.

The Survey.

TO UNITY READERS

Greetings from a like minded person who has a delightful country place on the East shore of Lake Michigan which she would like to share with you.

One hundred or more people can be accommodated—an ideal spot for group conferences on social questions.

If interested write—

ERMINA MOORE

Syringa Bluff South Haven, Mich.

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry

of Sir Walter Scott

With a Critical Introduction,

By

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press

114 Fifth Avenue New York City

The July and August Issue of

The New Humanist

includes the following articles:

THE SECOND GENERATION HUMANISTS
R. Lester Mondale

ON THE NATURE OF RELIGION

1. A Criticism of A. E. Haydon's Definition of Religion
   Norman B. Johnson
2. The Reply
   A. Eustace Haydon

A NEW RENDERING OF THE PASSION PLAY
Helen Sahler

SCIENCE AND FIRST PRINCIPLES
Arthur E. Murphy

THE CHURCH AND CIVIL LBERTIES
Harold Marley

SPECIAL OFFER TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS TO UNITY

"Unity" and "The New Humanist" will be sent to any address for $3.00, the yearly price of "Unity," when the subscription is placed through the New Humanist.

Send for Special Combination Book Offer and Bibliography of Humanist Books.

Subscription yearly.....$1.00
Single copy ..... .20

THE NEW HUMANIST

14 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio